



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/787,226	02/27/2004	Ryan Mason	049051-0222	4844
31824 7590 05/14/2010 MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP 18191 VON KARMAN AVE. SUITE 500 IRVINE, CA 92612-7108				
EXAMINER				
BELANI, KISHIN G				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2443				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/14/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner's Response to Special Amendment for 10/787,226

The proposed claim amendments, filed on 05/04/2010, after mailing of the final office action on 03/02/2010, will not be entered, as the amendments to independent claims 1, 7, 17 and 21 change the scope of the claims, requiring new search and consideration after the prosecution is closed. For example, by changing the claim text "wherein the user interface comprises software feature configured to allow the user to select ~~and modify~~ a connection icon from the desktop of the remote computing device ~~[[to]]~~ and alter the connection of the connection icon", the applicants are attempting to change the claim scope from selecting and modifying a connection icon to altering a connection itself. Similar scope modification is used in the subsequent claim element that is changed to recite "does not allow the connection of the connection icon to be modified" from "does not allow the connection icon to be modified".

Since the applicants have corrected misspelled text in claims 1, 7, 17 and 21, the claim objections to these claims are withdrawn. Also, the applicants have removed the use of trademarks from claims 1, 7, 17 and 21. Therefore, 35 U.S.C., first paragraph rejection of these claims is also being withdrawn. With appropriate amendments to claims 1, 7, 17 and 21, the applicants have also overcome 35 U.S.C. 101 rejections for these claims, as well as their dependent claims.

In response to applicants' argument on page 16 of the "Remarks" section that the cited reference of Henriquez does not teach or even suggest that the icon is placed on the desktop of the local system, the examiner would like to point out paragraphs 0006

and 0007 where comparison is made between using a Remote Desktop file (.rdp) and Henriquez's invention that permits a local system to run an application residing on a remote system to create the appearance as if the application actually resides on the local system, by displaying the icons (on the desktop) at the local system that substantially match in appearance as well as functionality with their iconic counterparts residing at the remote system. Paragraph 0010 which discloses that the generated user interface is virtualized at the local system 110, making it appear as if the application were running locally on the local system. Paragraph 0030 further teaches use of Remote Desktop Protocol (RDP) with Microsoft's Windows NT Server® operating system that enables applications to execute on the server (remote system 120) and communicate a remotely generated user interface over a connection which is displayed locally at the client 110 (see Fig. 1). Furthermore, paragraph 0036 discloses that when a user selects an icon associated with the remote application on the local system 210 (see Fig. 2), a remote **desktop** connection is established; which is in contrast to remote accessing of a host computer (e.g. PC anywhere) where a window is opened displaying the same display as that of the host computer; further disclosing that at least a subset of the transmitted iconic data is persistence at memory of the local system, and such subset of data can be updated with later format versions etc.; thereby disclosing dynamically generated user interface on a local system that virtualizes the desktop of the remote system, with icons for connecting to and executing remote applications, and means to alter the icons as disclosed in paragraph 0036.

On page 15 of the "Remarks" section, the applicants seem to confuse the different terminology used by Henriquez for designating which system is local and which one is remote. But, as the abstract makes it clear, the icon information is transmitted from a remote system (i.e. server) to a local system (i.e. client), the icon information being extracted from an application residing on the remote system. The local system decodes the information and displays the icon to a user. The icon is displayed such that the application appears to reside on the local system, rather than the remote system, where it actually resides.

Therefore, the examiner has concluded that the cited prior art adequately discloses or suggests all claim elements previously presented on 12/22/2009. The claims are therefore obvious over the cited prior art, non-novel and hence not allowable.

/K. G. B./

Examiner, Art Unit 2443

May 10, 2010

/George C Neurauter, Jr./

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2443